

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

Please replace the originally filed Fig. 1 with new Fig. 1 included on the attached drawing sheet marked REPLACEMENT SHEET. The new Fig. 1 has been amended to include reference to the axis 400. If, for any reason, the replacement drawing sheet is not in full compliance with the pertinent statutes and regulations, please so advise the undersigned.

Attachments:        One sheet (1) Replacement sheet including Figs 1 and 2.

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 8, 2010 (the "Office Action"). By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 55 and 56, adds new claims 58-77, and cancels claims 30-38 and 41-54 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims in a subsequently filed application. Support for the amended and new claims can be found in the originally filed application, including the as-filed specification, claims, and drawings. No new matter has been added. Claims 55, 56, and 58-77, of which claims 55 and 56 are independent, remain pending in this application.

**I. Drawings**

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for allegedly failing to show "the 'axis' of the core barrel." Office Action, p. 2. While not conceding the propriety of the drawing objection, Applicant has amended Fig. 1 to include a labeled representation of the axis 400 of the core barrel. Support for amended Fig. 1 can be found at least on page 2, ll. 5-8 of the originally filed specification. Additionally, Applicant has amended the specification to refer to axis 400 as noted in the concurrently filed amendments to the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the drawing objection be withdrawn.

**II. Claim Objection**

In the Office Action, claim 55 was objected to for allegedly including an informality. In particular, the Office Action stated that the phrase “support surfaces” should be replaced with --bearing surfaces--. In reply, Applicant has amended independent claim 55 as suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the claim objection be withdrawn.

**III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

In the Office Action, claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action suggested that the phrase “configured to deflect from an original configuration . . . and return to the original configuration” is an extreme version of the term ‘resiliently deformable’ in that the implied resilience is even claimed now to be 100%. Therefore, the claim amendment introduces new matter.” Office Action, p. 3, emphasis in original. In reply, Applicant has amended independent claim 56 such that the recitation at issue has been removed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

**IV. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claim 55 would be allowed if the objection set forth in the Office Action was overcome. By this Amendment, Applicant submits that the objection to claim 55 has been overcome, and that claim 55

is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claim 55.

**V. New Claims**

Applicant has added new claims 58-77. The claimed features are disclosed in this application and do not constitute new matter. The cited references do not anticipate or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 58-77.

**VI. Conclusion**

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicant declines to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In discussing the specification and claims in this Amendment, it is to be understood that Applicant is in no way intending to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 7, 2010

By:   
Jessica F. Winchester  
Reg. No. 65,285